



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

|  |             |                       |                          |                        |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
| 10/824,901   | 04/14/2004  | Daniel James Winarski | TUC9-2004-0009-US1       | 7571                   |
| 65384 7590 07/02/2007<br>INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION<br>c/o HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP<br>P.O. BOX 203518<br>AUSTIN, TX 78720 |             |                       | EXAMINER<br>TSUI, DANIEL |                        |
|  |             |                       | ART UNIT<br>2185         | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                       | MAIL DATE<br>07/02/2007  | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/824,901

Applicant(s)

WINARSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Tsui

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The objection to the title has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
2. The rejection to claims 24-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn in view of amendments made to the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 13, 14, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Basham.

As per claims 13 and 21, Basham teaches a data storage device comprising:

- a data storage media for storage of data (cartridge 150; see figure 1);
- a processor for controlling said data storage device (controller 106; see figure 1);
- a WORM pointer memory coupled to said processor for storage of a WORM pointer (write append limiter 151; see figure 1), said WORM pointer providing an inventory of locations where WORM data can be written within said data storage media (the areas past the pointer can be written to; see paragraph 11, lines 12-16);
- a host device interface coupled to said processor for receiving commands from a host computer (interface 109; see figure 1).

Basham also teaches a data storage system with a host computer (host 102; see figure 1) and the data storage device.

As per claims 14 and 22, Basham teaches executing the write command to write data as WORM data on the data storage device (see paragraph 34, lines 12-14; and paragraph 49, lines 3-6).

As per claim 19, Basham teaches the WORM pointer memory located inside a sealed portion of the data storage device (the write append limiter is a part of the cartridge; see figure 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-5, 15, and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basham (US PGPub 2002/0035665) in view of Sokolov (US 6,018,789).

As per claims 1 and 24, Basham teaches a method for writing data on a data storage device and an article of manufacture storing instructions for a method comprising the steps of:

said data storage device receiving a write command (step 406, and paragraph 47, lines 12-13);

obtaining a starting LBA from said write command (see paragraph 48, line 14);

obtaining a first WORM pointer (write append limiter 151) from a WORM pointer memory (see paragraph 28), said WORM pointer providing an inventory of LBAs where

Art Unit: 2185

WORM data can be written within said data storage media ((the areas past the pointer can be written to; see paragraph 11, lines 12-16);

in response to said starting LBA being greater than or equal to said WORM pointer, executing said write command (see paragraph 49, and paragraph 11, lines 12-16).

Basham does not teach the write command including a LBA transfer length for the method to obtain. Sokolov teaches a data transfer request including a starting LBA and a transfer length. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the method taught by Basham to use a write command that includes a starting LBA and a LBA transfer length so they system can know how much data is in the transfer request.

As per claims 15 and 23, Basham teaches the data storage device and data storage system as applied in the rejection to claims 13 and 21 above. Basham does not teach the write command including a LBA transfer length for the method to obtain. Sokolov teaches a data transfer request including a starting LBA and a transfer length. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the device taught by Basham to use a write command that includes a starting LBA and a LBA transfer length so it can know how much data is in the transfer request.

As per claims 2 and 25, Basham teaches executing the write command to write data as WORM data on the data storage device (see paragraph 34, lines 12-14; and paragraph 49, lines 3-6).

As per claims 3 and 26, Basham teaches aborting the write command in response to the starting LBA being less than the first WORM pointer (see paragraph 52, line 14).

As per claims 4 and 27, Basham updating the WORM pointer after the write command has executed (see paragraph 57). Basham does not teach calculating a second WORM pointer that is equal to the numerical sum of the first WORM pointer and the transfer length and storing the second WORM pointer in the WORM pointer memory. Sokolov teaches the use of a write transfer length as applied in the rejections above. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to update the WORM pointer by generating a second WORM pointer that is equal to the sum of the first WORM pointer and the write transfer length. This new sum represents the end of the previous WORM data plus all the data written during the write transfer. It would then be obvious to store this new WORM pointer in the WORM memory since it represents the new collection of all the WORM data.

As per claims 5, 20, and 28, the combination of references teaches the method of updating the WORM pointer as claimed. Basham also teaches the use of a time stamp with the WORM pointer (see paragraph 49, line 20). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a date stamp with the WORM pointer so the system can know when the WORM data was last written to.

7. Claims 6-8, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basham in view of Sokolov and further in view of Gill (US 6,469,854).

The combination of Basham and Sokolov teach the method for writing data to a data storage device as applied in the rejections to claims 1 and 24 above. The references do not teach rewriting the data in response to determining that the write command executed with at least one error. Gill teaches detecting a write error and rewriting the data to the same address (see column 1, lines 42-44). As per claims 6, 7, and 29, it would have been obvious for the method to rewrite the data at the starting LBA in response to determining that the write command executed with an error so that the write command can be retried and executed without error. As per claims 8 and 30, Gill teaches writing an indication of the error into the storage (see column 5, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious for the rewriting to begin at an LBA greater than the starting LBA so that the error indication data can be written at the starting LBA. This would allow the system to determine what type of writing error occurred when the data is read later.

8. Claims 9, 10, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basham in view of Sokolov and further in view of Mimatsu (US PGPub 2004/0111485).

The combination of Basham and Sokolov teach the method for writing data to a data storage device as applied in the rejections to claims 1 and 24 above. The references do not teach sending a device type to the host computer in response to

Art Unit: 2185

receiving a first inquiry and sending the WORM pointer in response to receiving a second inquiry. Mimatsu teaches sending device type information in response to an inquiry command so the system can know what type of storage device is being used and configure the system appropriately (see paragraph 51, lines 9-12). It would have been obvious to send the device type information to the host in response to a first inquiry so that the host can configure the system appropriately and to send the WORM point in response to the second inquiry after the system has been configured.

9. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basham in view of non-volatile memory ("Non-volatile Memory chips" NPL). As applied in the rejection to claim 13 above, Basham teaches the data storage device with a WORM pointer memory. Basham also teaches the WORM pointer memory being part of a cartridge for the data storage media (see paragraph 28). Basham does not teach the WORM pointer memory being an EPROM, PROM, or FLASH. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the WORM pointer memory in a nonvolatile storage on the cartridge so that the pointer can be accessed without having to read the actual storage media. The non-patent literature teaches that it was well known at the time the invention was made to use EPROM, PROM, and FLASH memory as different forms of nonvolatile storage. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have the WORM pointer memory be either an EPROM, PROM, or FLASH memory since any



Art Unit: 2185

would offer the benefits of the nonvolatile storage in combination with the cartridge taught by Basham.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's first point of argument is that Basham does not teach a "WORM pointer." The Examiner contends the append limiter taught by Basham is a "WORM" pointer as it point to an area in the storage media where data is designated as WORM and therefore unchangeable and another area where data can still be written to. Furthermore, this WORM point provide an inventory of locations here WORM data can be written because all regions after the append limiter can be written to and thus can be considered "an inventory of locations where WORM data can be written."

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Tsui whose telephone number is (571)270-1022. The examiner can normally be reached on M through F, 8:00-4:30 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sanjiv Shah can be reached on (571)272-4098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2185

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Daniel Tsui  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2185

**GARY PORTKA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

